LIBRARY AUG 9 17

The War Paper for Women

VOTES FOR WOMEN

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE UNITED SUFFRAGISTS

VOL. IX. (Fourth Series) No. 429. JULY, 1917. Price 1d. Monthly (Post Free 1½d.)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Outlook	273
Franchise Reform in Holland. By Martina G. Kramers	274
Our Women Councillors	275
Penal Reform and Criminal Law	275
Correspondence—E. H. Aickin, E. Pethick Lawrence, Vida Goldstein, F. K. Powell	275
"It was a Famous Victory." By Evelyn Sharp	276
The Record of Half-a-Century. By F. W. Pethick Lawrence.	277
United Suffragists' Campaign	278
Electoral Reform Bill in Committee	279

DEDICATION

To the brave women who to-day are fighting for freedom: to the noble women who all down the ages kept the flag flying and looked forward to this day without seeing it: to all women all over the world, of whatever race, or creed, or calling, whether they be with us or against us in this fight, we dedicate this paper.

THE OUTLOOK

The triumphant majorities secured for Woman Suffrage, during the two-days' debate in the Committee stage of the Representation of the People Bill, have assured beyond all doubt the retention of Clause 4 by the Commons as an integral part of the Bill. The Anti-Suffragists managed to whip up a minority of 57 against the Suffrage principle, on June 19, which sank on the following day, in the division on the motion to add the whole Clause to the Bill, to what the *Nation* calls "a miserable seventeen." This does not necessarily mean that the opposition to the Clause in the House of Lords will break down as completely; but it ought to mean that the Upper House will be unable to ignore such a mandate from the Commons for the immediate enfranchisement of women. As we go to press, the Bill is passing rapidly through Committee; the Report stage will probably be reached by the second week in July, and, failing unforeseen contingencies, the Bill ought to go up to the Lords before the end of the month.

Widening the Municipal Franchise

It was clear from the first that any attempt to widen the women's Parliamentary franchise proposals would be regarded as wrecking amendments. Sir George Cave, who has charge of the Bill, announced on the second day of the debate that he intended to put on the Government whips against such amendments—the interpretation we anticipated in our June issue of Mr. Walter Long's announcement, on May 15, that the recommendations of the Speaker's Conference, as regarded Woman Suffrage and Proportional Representation, were to be accepted or rejected "by the House" as they stood. The Home Secretary, however, took a less rigid view of the proposals for the women's Local Government franchise, and promised a favourable consideration, on the Report stage, of Mr. Charles Roberts' amendment to extend the municipal vote, as well as the Parliamentary vote, to the wives of Local Government electors. This will be strongly supported by Suffragists, for, as the *Westminster Gazette* says—"It is really hardly conceivable that a Parliament could be so foolish as to forbid wives who vote one day for a member of Parliament to vote next day for a town or district councillor." There should be plenty of Parliamentary support, too, for such an amendment; for the Anti-Suffragists have always held the curious doctrine that while the woman's political franchise is a danger to the State. there should be no limit to her municipal powers.

The Referendum Bogey

The Speaker's ruling on Mr. Arnold Ward's amendment, to submit Clause 4 to a referendum of the people, has, it is to be hoped, dealt the final blow to this last hope of the Anti-Suffragists. Mrs. Humphry Ward, in a public letter, has re-stated the case for adopting this un-English procedure in the matter of Woman Suffrage; and a manifesto, to the same effect, signed by her and many of her colleagues, appeared in the advertisement columns of the *Times* on June 23, as a counterblast to the very able statement of the case for Woman Suffrage, which had appeared a day or two earlier, and which was issued with the far more effective support of large organised bodies of women. The *Manchester Guardian*, in a leading article, thus disposes of the demand for a referendum:—

> There have been three changes made by Parliament during this war, each of them immeasurably more serious and more revolutionary than the grant of the vote to women. One was conscription. Another was the Defence of the Realm Act, which abolished all the ancient safeguards of liberty, and made the Cabinet dictator of this country, with absolute power over the lives, the persons, and the property of us all. The third was the extension of its own life by Parliament, which made Parliament independent of the electorate. None of these revolutions was effected by referendum, and we do not remember that in the case of any of them the anti-suffragists asked for a referendum. Under such circumstances, to insist that Parliament must not grant women the vote without a referendum hardly appears to be a convincing argument. That apart, it is evident that the public wants no referendum. It has come to regard women's suffrage as one of the inevitable things, the sooner achieved the better.

It can be urged, of course, that the *Manchester Guardian* talks like this because it is a Suffragist paper. But the following passage is equally emphatic:—

> Three hundred and eighty-seven against fifty-seven are figures which completely dispose of the suggestion that the presence of a few additional Service members would have turned the balance the other way. There is no longer any loophole for denouncing the action of the House of Commons as unconstitutional, in the sense of being unrepresentative, or for supposing that a referendum, whether of men or of women, would reverse it. . . . Beyond all question the change in the attitude of the House of Commons is an accurate reflection of the change in the country at large.

And this passage appeared in the *Times* (June 20), once the stronghold of Sir Almroth Wright, who has now, we see, been driven to the columns of the *Morning Post*.

Votes for Boys of 19?

We shall not know until the Report stage the extent to which Clause 5, under discussion as we go to press, will be affected by Sir George Cave's undertaking to give effect to the desire, expressed by several Members of the House, that soldiers and sailors of 19, who have seen active service, shall be given the vote as a reward. The scheme would appear to be unworkable, however generous the sentiment that inspires it; for who is to define "active service" since there are many men who would like to be at the Front but are kept in this country, besides the great army of munition workers, who have been told all through the war that their work is as essential as that of the fighting forces, and who include women. Besides, as Lord Hugh Cecil pointed out, the vote is not a reward; if it were, no excuse in the world could justify the exclusion of women under thirty from the Franchise. We do not think the Government will be able to frame an amendment, meeting all the obvious difficulties of the case, though with this we have no concern beyond a real desire to see as many people enfranchised as possible. What does concern us is the possible effect of such a change upon the balance of the whole Bill. If the compromise is to be departed from in order to set up a privileged class of male voters under age, Suffragists cannot fairly be expected to maintain their unswerving loyalty to a franchise they detest on the ground that it is part of that compromise. Several speakers in the debate on Clause 5 seemed to realise this. But, as we have already intimated, we do not think the suggested change is a practicable one.

Gems of the Discussion

Probably, both Press and Parliament, apart from the coming debate in the Lords, will never again have to discuss the question of the principle of woman suffrage; and we are inclined to agree with the comment of the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* on the Woman Suffrage debate, that "On the whole we think the country will accept the decision with a sigh of relief." We can find it in our hearts, being on the winning side, to pardon the fulminations of the *Morning Post* under the title, "The Capitulation of Man": it is perhaps the last chance it will have of fulminating on this particular theme. And women omnibus conductors may be gratified to learn that Mr. Gossip of the *Daily Sketch*—or it may have been The Man in the Street—was converted by one of them to the cause whose success on June 19 was described in the *Manchester Guardian* as "a great revolution" which "must be a very great piece of news to telegraph to Russia." While we are mentioning gems of this kind, it would be a pity to leave out Sir Robert Williams' contribution to the debate in the House, in which he contended that "nowhere in the Divine Economy do I find a provision that the woman is to be the ruling class over the men: it is male and female, not female and male." For an anatomical "howler," Major Sir B. Falle's allusion, in the same debate, to "a week-kneed jellyfish backbone" would be hard to beat. One hopes that when Woman Suffrage has long ceased to divide both parties and individuals (as another House of Commons orator said not long ago) some new contentious cause will provide matter for unconscious humour.

Children and War Conditions

The Ministry of Labour and the Board of Education have been expressing concern at the growing tendency among women teachers to leave their profession in order to take up war work. We agree with both Departments that education is work of the greatest national importance, even in war time; but we cannot say we are surprised that some teachers fail to perceive this. Ever since war broke out, local education authorities all over the country have been granting exemptions to children of school age, especially in response to the demand for boys in agricultural work; while there has been little disposition on the part of the military authorities to consider that the education of the nation's children is work of national importance for which exemption from military service might be granted. We see that in the United States attempts were made immediately on the declaration of war to suspend the Child Labour Law; and it is interesting to note that the Department of Labour opposed this and other reactionary tendencies, saying that all the experience of England in war time points to the waste and danger of child labour. Our country is rightly stirred to the depths by the terrible death roll and casualty list of the child victims of the London air raid in June. At least we should see to it that war does not in other ways victimise the nation's children.

Bankruptcy and Voteless Women

We do not know how many Suffragists there are who have consistently refused for some time past to pay taxes on the ground that it is unconstitutional to do so while still voteless; nor do we know in how many cases the Crown's claim, with the aid of costs for successive judgments, has now amounted to £50 or upwards, thus rendering these women liable to be proceeded against by the Attorney-General and adjudged bankrupt in default of payment. In holding to their principles and making a stand against this method of violating conscience (which incidentally accumulates costs until the alleged debt is enormously greater than the original tax), both Miss Evelyn Sharp and Dr. Mary Patch, who was similarly proceeded against earlier in the year, have striven to demonstrate its injustice—and so, perhaps, to lessen the sum of injustice in the world—and also to make it more difficult for the Crown to victimize others in the same way. We understand that Miss Evelyn Sharp is thought by some people to have chosen this particular moment to refuse to pay income tax on her earnings. That is not so. It is the Crown that has chosen this particular moment to bring the proceedings; and the claim in respect of the unpaid tax dates back over five or six years, during which no attempt was made to collect the amount by distraint. It is impossible to avoid the suspicion that Miss Sharp's conscience was respected when publicity would have helped the cause for which she made her protest, and disregarded as soon as the cause (happily) no longer needed this help. The adjournment of her public examination from June 12 until July 10, at 11 a.m., whatever the motive of the adjournment, has had the effect of prolonging the period in which she can be subjected to the censorship of all her letters and the other annoyances attendant upon the condition of an undischarged bankrupt, while the costs of the proceedings are allowed to accumulate still further.

Items of Interest

According to Reuter, the new Esterhazy Ministry in Hungary proposes to extend the franchise to a limited class of women, including owners of businesses. The Hungarian Feminist Union is agitating for votes for all women.

Two new Orders have been instituted, both open to women:—"The Order of the British Empire," the first two classes of which will carry with them the honour of knighthood, and for women the right to the title of "Dame"; and "The Order of the Companions of Honour."

Surgeon-General Sir Alfred Keogh, Director-General of the Army Medical Service, spoke highly at a meeting, held by Lady Londonderry on behalf of the South London Women's Hospital, of the valuable work done by that hospital (which is entirely staffed by women) in treating venereal diseases.

In a speech made at a meeting in the College of Ambulance, Miss Halford said that the number of infant welfare centres had been increased from 400 in 1914 to over 1,000 this year.

Among the recently elected candidates for the district councils in Petrograd are 24 women.

At the Ministry of Labour, Miss Isabel Sloan (Assistant Secretary to Miss Mary Macarthur at the National Federation of Women Workers) has been appointed to co-operate with Sir George Askwith in dealing with labour disputes in which women are affected.

The Holland (Lincolnshire) County Council have appointed Mrs. M. A. Harcourt, M.B., Ch.B. (Edinburgh), as temporary medical officer and school medical officer for the county, in place of a medical man, resigned.

The hon. Secretary of the Irishwomen's Reform League writes to the Press, urging the direct representation of women in the Irish Convention. Their appointment, she represents, would not only be of service in the work of the Convention, but would also be a recognition "of the fact that a nation is made up of women as well as men."

The Representation of the People Bill was supported by a public meeting held in the Central Hall, Westminster, on the night that Clause 4 was passed. Lord Courtney presided, and the speakers were the Rt. Honble. Sir John Simon, K.C., M.P., Miss Eva Gore-Booth, Mr. Philip Morrell, M.P., Mr. Pringle, M.P., and Mr. Aneurin Williams, M.P.

The Liberals who voted in the minority against the principle of Woman Suffrage, on June 19, were Mr. Rowland Barran, Mr. Hector Morrison, Sir Charles Seely, Sir Hastings Duncan, Sir Maurice Levy, Sir Charles Hobhouse, Sir Charles Henry, Mr. William Young, Sir William Priestley, Mr. Molteno, and Sir Francis Layland-Barratt.

The Women's Reserve Ambulance, with nine cars, reached the worst scene of the London air raid within half-an-hour of the catastrophe, and remained on duty till eleven at night. At the time of the Silvertown explosion they worked for three days and three nights.

FRANCHISE REFORM IN HOLLAND

Another Step Towards Woman Suffrage

(*From a Special Correspondent.*)

The revision of our Constitution, unanimously adopted by the Second Chamber on November 16, 1916, has now been carried unanimously by the First Chamber also, on May 16, 1917. It is a partial revision, and it concerns only electoral reform and school reform. It introduces proportional representation, makes women eligible for governing bodies, and gives to the ordinary electoral law the power of enfranchising women, which is now forbidden by Art. 80 of the existing Constitution. So, undoubtedly, suffragists must regard the revision as a gain; and most of us do; but there are those who feel disappointed at not having at once obtained full political equality for men and women, now that extraordinary circumstances have shown the value of women's work, intellect and advice.

Revising the Constitution is rather slow work, and the scheme to do it was announced by the Premier in September, 1915. The great victories of woman suffrage all over the world within the last two years had not yet exercised their influence then; and having once proposed eligibility and made possible the enfranchisement of women, the Premier did not wish to accept amendments ensuring their political equality with men. If the Members who moved them had insisted, there is no telling what change the Second Chamber might have effected; but as it is, the amendments were withdrawn and the Revision will make women eligible for the First and Second Chambers, for the Provincial States and for the Municipal Councils, and leave it to the law to give them the vote when and on whatever conditions it pleases, provided these be not dependent on property qualifications.

M.P.'s—Not Voters

The Revision has still two stages to pass through before it will be actually on the Statute Book: it has to be adopted by a two-thirds majority in each of the two Chambers, which are to be elected for that special purpose, and the Queen has to sign it and so give it the Royal sanction. Before September it can become law.

To explain the whole situation, we must say that a small fraction of public opinion, led by the biggest daily paper, *Da Telegraaf*, the maker of the present electoral law, Dr. S. van Houten, and the discontented Suffragists, is trying its utmost to oppose the Revision, but with little chance of success. And yet another danger to the united action of the Woman Suffrage Association comes from a difference in view as to the value and the use to be made of the eligibility of women, once this has become law. Some believe that two or three women in the Second Chamber may have there so favourable an influence on the side of the total enfranchisement of their sex that it would be worth while for the W. S. Association to make the utmost efforts to get them elected, though we should make all the existing political parties our enemies. On the other hand, others—we may hope a majority—see the danger of splitting up the Association by thus nominating a list of women candidates and obliging all our members, M.P.s, politicians, or convinced members of political parties, to leave the W.S.A. And with that, although it would not be difficult to get twenty-five electors to sign this women's list, there would be very little chance of getting the 14,000 votes required for a certain seat, or even the 7,000 required for a possible seat in the Second Chamber.

A Tactical Danger

The present Constitution of the N.W.S.A. provides for the use of "every legal means to gain the franchise for women"; we must hope that this provision may not be changed into an injunction to nominate female candidates at the summer meeting of the W.S.A. There may be different currents of opinion, but on the whole the main body of 24,000 suffragists is generally sensible enough in its action. Experience of proportional representation and of lists of women candidates in the Scandinavian countries may help to enlighten Dutch suffragists and clear their doubts before their next General Meeting.

Meanwhile the Dutch Government is making one shy little step forward on the road to political equality for men and women.

Martina G. Kramers.

Rotterdam, May 29, 1917.

OUR WOMEN COUNCILLORS

The Women's Local Government Society (19, Tothill Street, S.W.1) has chosen an opportune moment to issue a leaflet giving the names and numbers of the women members of Local Authorities in England and Wales. These include two Mayors—Mrs. Kenyon (Dukinfeld) and Mrs. Partington (re-elected, Glossop)—and two ex-Mayors—Alderman Mrs. C. E. Lees (Oldham) and Councillor Morgan (Brecon). We have not space to give all the names of women Councillors now sitting, which can be obtained from the leaflet itself; but the following list of statistics may interest our readers:—

WOMEN ON LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

Of 62 County Councils, 4 have women members (8 women); 58 have none. Of 80 County Borough Councils, 12 have women members (15 women); 68 have none. Of 245 Town Councils (non-county borough), 10 have women members (10 women); 235 have none. 28 Met. Borough Councils, 11 have women members (24 women); 17 have none. 803 Urban District Councils, 14 have women members (19 women); 789 have none. 652 Rural District Councils, 141 have women members (206 women); 511 have none. 639 Poor Law Unions, 454 have women Guardians (1,585 women); 185 have none. 7,205 Parish Councils, the total number of women serving is unknown.

It must be remembered that no elections have been held since the outbreak of war, so that the residential qualification provided by the County and Borough Councils (Qualification) Act, 1914, has not yet had its due effect in increasing the number of women on Councils. We may add to this our hope that conferring the Parliamentary franchise upon women and improving to some extent their local government status (though unfortunately not much) will, if the Representation of the People Bill passes into law, considerably quicken the somewhat lukewarm interest now taken by the mass of women in local affairs.

PENAL REFORM AND CRIMINAL LAW

Under the auspices of the Penal Reform League, a Conference was held in the Caxton Hall, Westminster, on Friday, June 15; at which the speakers were Lord Henry Cavendish-Bentinck, M.P. (chair), Dr. Helen Wilson, Mrs. Swanwick, Mr. T. R. Bridgwater, and Captain Arthur St. John. The following resolutions were passed:—

(1) This Conference advocates the repeal of all laws regarding "solicitation" and reliance on the law against what is commonly understood as molestation or annoyance.

(2) That places of Reception and Detention, quite apart from prisons and police stations, be used for all arrested persons before conviction; that offenders between 16 and 21 should not be imprisoned, but, if not discharged or released on their own recognisances should be placed on probation; that advantage should be taken of the Criminal Justice Administration Act, 1914, to extend the use of probation and widen the range of its conditions so as to include sojourn in institutions and colonies, where endeavours to attain to a free and homely atmosphere, variety of occupational training, and discipline based on individual and collective responsibility would be encouraged.

Irish Women's Protest

A letter has been sent to the Home Secretary protesting, firstly, against the injustice shown in the Brentford case of last April, in which two young women, who were ultimately discharged, were submitted to an obnoxious medical examination while on remand; and, secondly, against—

all legislation, whether already in force, or merely in contemplation *and being nevertheless illegally acted upon*, which discriminates unequally between the sexes, penalising and humiliating women as a result of a social evil in which men are equally culpable.

CORRESPONDENCE

Representation of the People Bill?

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—I am much surprised that the U.S. welcome and support so inadequate a solution of the Women's Suffrage question as the Bill now before Parliament, and am strongly of opinion that suffragists are only wasting their time and energy in giving any recognition to such a disgraceful compromise as the present Bill. Surely, our only safe ground is to demand a Government measure for Women's Suffrage only. I am an adult suffragist, and although one would gladly work for the redress of all injustice in this matter, one can only work for the removal of the most glaring at a given time; therefore, I hold that women ought to be given votes before men are given *more* votes. To support my contention, may I quote some sentences from the June number of VOTES FOR WOMEN contained in "The Outlook" under the title, "The Chances of Success"? The point of view is put as follows (the italics being mine):—"Although nothing must be left to chance, the chances of Women's Suffrage seem good, *provided that the Bill itself goes through.* As Sir John Simon pointed out in the debate, the real danger lies in the possible co-operation of all the various elements of the opposition to *different clauses* of the Bill, when the division on the Third Reading is taken."

And, again, under the heading, "United States—South Africa—Sweden":—"We learn, too, from the *Woman's Outlook* that an attempt was made last February to include women in the Electoral Bill then under consideration in the South African House of Assembly, and although the motion was negatived by 63 votes to 28, *it was claimed that the opposition was based mainly on the inexpediency of amending this particular Bill, and not on antagonism to Women's Suffrage.* As we have heard this argument before in many countries, we hope South Africa will soon see the wisdom of dropping it and dealing honestly and generously with the women."

I applaud the sentiment expressed in the concluding lines, and all the more wonder, dear madam, why you and your colleagues do not take up the same stand in regard to the same matter "within our gates"; as I contend the present Bill is neither "dealing honestly" nor "generously" with our own countrywomen. And, further, I believe that even if this instalment of the suffrage were granted it would seriously retard the consummation of our demand, as it would soothe the public conscience, and still more divide Suffrage opinion, as I fear it is intended to do.

I am at a loss to understand how any Suffragist considers that, despite all its defects, the Bill is a "great advance towards our ultimate goal" in the enfranchisement of six million women out of many times that number at the absurd age of thirty years.

No, let Suffragists unite in their demand for a Government measure on the one issue of the enfranchisement of women; then both friends and foes will have to come out into the open, and Suffragists will be saved wasting their time and dignity running after a will o' the wisp subterfuge that only delays, but cannot prevent, the enfranchisement of women.—Yours, etc., E. H. AICKIN.

168, Wilbury Road, Letchworth, Herts.

[Our correspondent has forgotten that there is a war. It is possible that if, at the beginning of the war, the great mass of woman suffragists had not left it to a few stalwarts to keep the suffrage flag flying, a measure to remove the sex disability might have been carried previously to the introduction of the Representation of the People Bill, or this Bill might have enfranchised women on a wider basis than it now proposes to do. In view of the altered situation produced by the war (which made the enfranchisement of more men in any case inevitable), the United Suffragists felt that the only statesmanlike course to pursue was, first, to demand an Adult Suffrage Bill, instead of a Registration Bill (which, even if practicable, would have enfranchised no women at all), and, secondly, to refrain from obstructing—they do not pretend to be enthusiastic about it—a Bill that with all its faults will enfranchise about five times as many women as the old limited Suffrage Bill would have done. We think the majority of our readers will agree that no other course could have been taken by the U.S. or any society that had the interests of women at heart.—Editor, VOTES FOR WOMEN.]

MOTHERS' PENSIONS

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—One evening last October I turned into a Suffrage meeting held in a little hall off the Holborn thoroughfare, and there I heard a story told in a very simple and matter-of-fact way by an American judge—a story about one of my "impossible dreams" that had "come true." It had come true in the speaker's country, because he had dreamed it more passionately and actively than I, or anyone else, had done here, and had given up a large bit of his own life to *make* it come true.

That man was Judge Neil, of Chicago. He is in London now. He is going to tell the story again in the Central Hall, Westminster, on Thursday, July 5, at 8 p.m., and all Suffragists should be there to hear it. It is the story of how in thirty of the States in America the mother, who takes care of her children in the home, is regarded as an honoured server of the community; and if she is a widow, or a deserted wife, or for other reasons is unable to find the money to bring up her children in decency, the State, instead of taking her children away from her, endows the children who are too young to earn wages and makes the mother the administrator of the fund. The details of this system, known in America as the Mothers' Pensions Scheme, will be explained by Judge Neil on July 5. It will rejoice the hearts of all Suffragists to hear Judge Neil speak of the conditions of the working woman's life and of the way the average working-class mother fulfils, under supreme difficulties, the almost impossible task—fulfils it, because it is a labour of love. He calls upon the community to appreciate that love-force and to turn it to account. "The more you help the mother, the more the mother helps." That is his passionate belief, and he proves it in figures and facts.

With his very simple and practical appeal he has already touched many influential sections of people here. A movement is on foot to press for this method of dealing with child poverty in this country. A resolution to this effect will be submitted to the meeting in the Central Hall on July 5. Admission to the meeting is free, but seats at 2s. 6d. and 1s. (unnumbered) will be reserved, and can be obtained at the Women's International League, 12, Little College Street, Westminster.—Yours, &c.,

EMMELINE PETHICK LAWRENCE.

LADY ASKWITH AND AUSTRALIA

The following letter appears in the "Woman Voter" (Melbourne) as having been sent to VOTES FOR WOMEN. *As it has not reached us, probably owing to trouble with the mails, we publish it now:—*

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—I have just read in VOTES of January, 1917, the statement by Lady Askwith that compulsory notification and treatment of venereal disease "are already either enforced by law or about to be so, in those countries where women have most political power. . . . In Australia they are already law in some States, and the Commonwealth Commission on Venereal Disease has just passed a unanimous report recommending them. . . . Women in the countries where they have more power have not only demanded, but secured, them."

My information from Denmark, Norway, and the United States is to the effect that the representative women of those countries are resolutely opposed to compulsory methods of dealing with venereal disease. It may be that I have heard only one side of the case in those countries, and that Lady Askwith is better informed about it than I, but I can assure you that Lady Askwith is utterly mistaken in thinking that Australian women "have not only demanded, but secured," compulsory notification and treatment. The Commonwealth Commission was composed of men only, and they did not call for evidence from representative women on the subject. Not one women's society has declared in favour of compulsion. West Australia and Victoria have passed the compulsory provisions in the teeth of the opposition of every women's organisation that has dealt with the question, and of many men's organisations also, headed in West Australia by the Anglican Bishop of Perth, Dr. Riley.

On the authority of the late Chief Secretary of New South Wales, who has made a special study of legislation dealing with venereal disease, and who has recently returned from the West, the Act there is a complete failure, and it seems as if it will also fail in Victoria; although the Act is on the Statute book, it is not yet being administered. In Queensland the Government is trying to pass an almost identical Bill, and there also women's organisations are arrayed against it.

It may be said by English anti-suffragists: "So the women's vote is powerless. Measures to which women are opposed are passed into law." Precisely. Just as measures to which men are opposed are passed into law, even though men are directly represented in Parliament as women are not. Neither men nor women speak with one voice on any question, except after many years of educational work. The educational work in regard to venereal disease is only just beginning in Australia. A few medical men have succeeded in two States out of six in getting this obnoxious legislation passed, but our women to the extent of their organised power have declared unanimously against it.—Yours, &c., VIDA GOLDSTEIN.

Guild Hall, Melbourne,
March 10, 1917.

PUNISHMENTS OF THE LAW

To the Editor of VOTES FOR WOMEN.

Dear Madam,—In reply to T. O'Meara's second letter, may I say with reference to her first that the proposal of the Hammersmith Borough to punish men who frequent brothels (equally or unequally with the women) is of first-class importance? For (1) Women are already, as aiders and abettors, punished for frequenting brothels, therefore as a matter of justice the men should also be punished. (2) The men are more responsible in that they pay the women. (3) It would be a great deterrent because of the shame connected with such actions. (4) It is the only effectual way to put down brothels. In Newport, Mon., men are now equally punished with women for aiding and abetting brothel-keeping.

In her second letter T. O'Meara says on the one hand the punishments of the law have no effect at all upon stealing, murdering, prostituting, &c., yet on the other hand she says—whatever the statement may mean—that the antiquated marriage laws, together with the "conspiracy of silence," have such a bad effect that men are bound to resort to houses of ill-fame and women to welcome them there! I may mention, however, that some barbarous and semi-barbarous peoples have not tolerated, and do not tolerate, the prostitution of their women. Also, though the sexual instinct is universal, houses of ill-fame do not exist to satisfy that instinct; they exist to exploit it; and the men are not welcomed, even in the official brothels, by the women—rather the brothel-keeper—unless they pay them.—Yours, &c.,

F. K. POWELL.

Articles and News contributed for insertion in VOTES FOR WOMEN should be sent to The Editors, VOTES FOR WOMEN, 27 Chancery Lane, W.C. 2.

Subscriptions to the paper should be sent to The Publisher, VOTES FOR WOMEN, 27, Chancery Lane, W.C.2.

The terms are (while a monthly issue), post free, 2s. annual subscription, 1s. for six months, inside the United Kingdom; 2s. (½dol.) and 1s. (25 cents) abroad, payable in advance.

VOTES FOR WOMEN

27, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

Telegraphic Address:—Unisuffra, Holb., London
Telephone:—Holborn 5880

JULY, 1917.

"IT WAS A FAMOUS VICTORY"

On June 19 the House of Commons in Committee decided by a majority of seven to one to include Woman Suffrage in the Representation of the People Bill. On June 20, in a smaller House, the Commons accepted by a majority of twelve to one the terms of the Speaker's Conference on which the Bill proposes to enfranchise women.

The Remaining Stages

The passage of the whole Bill through its remaining stages in the House of Commons, and afterwards through the House of Lords, will now be looked for with intense eagerness by all Suffragists; and there is fortunately very little reason to suppose that, having survived the Franchise clauses in Committee, the Bill will not be able to triumph further over any other opposition that may assail it in the course of the next few weeks. The possibility that controversy over Proportional Representation may endanger its progress is not very great, in view of the general spirit of agreement that seems to pervade Parliament with regard to this vitally needed Reform Bill; and in view also of the statement that the advocates of "P. R." may placate the opposition of the London Members by consenting to the elimination of London from the suggested Parliamentary areas in which it is proposed to try this interesting electoral experiment. The Attorney General's announcement, during the debate on Clause 4, that, if Proportional Representation were rejected, he and perhaps others would have to reconsider their votes in favour of the Woman Suffrage Clause, does not alarm us very much. In the face of the overwhelming Suffrage majorities of June 19 and 20, it will be politically and morally impossible for any House of Commons to send up the Bill to the Lords without Clause 4 in it, and equally impossible for the Government to carry such a crippled measure even to a successful Third Reading. With regard to our chances in the Lords, what we said in our last issue not only still holds good, but has been immensely strengthened by the two great divisions on Clause 4. The Upper House, with its regard for constitutionalism and its respect for what appear to be irrevocable changes in public opinion, cannot be unaffected by the almost unanimous demand of the People's House for the admission of women to citizenship. The one thing left for Suffragists to do, both inside and outside the House, in order doubly to ensure the final passage of the Bill, is to secure a great majority for its Third Reading in the Commons.

The Moment of Victory

The moment of victory in the history of any cause is apt to bring with it a certain sense of anti-climax, unless, as rarely happens except in Revolution, victory is acknowledged at the moment when it is really gained. Woman Suffrage is a cause that was won in this country long before the summer of 1917, in which we may now assume it will be granted. If a particular date could be named for the real victory of our movement, that day on which a procession, five miles long, of Suffragists of every shade of Suffrage opinion, marched between massed and cheering London crowds in support of the Conciliation Bill—June 17, 1911—might be selected. Our cause, in the country, was won then. It was won, too, in the House of Commons, which had already passed the Second Reading of the Conciliation Bill once, and was about to do so again by a majority of 167. And, within the limitations of that particular Bill, it was almost certainly won in the House of Lords, too, provided it had the backing of the Government. But the Government refused, as Governments do, to acknowledge our victory; and so, for another weary six years, to the weariness of which was added later the tragic anguish of war, Suffragists had to wander again in the wilderness before reaching their promised land. That is the common destiny of chosen peoples, of those who fight without giving in, who go on fighting with or without victory. Unfortunately, the distinction of belonging to the few who are chosen is tempered throughout the ages by the lamentable indifference of the many who are called—and only answer the call when there is nothing to be done except to claim the fruits of victory. These reformers' platitudes would not be worth setting down but for the need of some explanation of that sense of anti-climax which, now that the vote is within our grasp, tends to replace the enthusiasm of 1911, when it was still unattainable.

Lest We Forget

The fruits of that unforgettable enthusiasm have now ripened and are the heritage of the future, just as surely as the roots of it lie planted deep in a past of which no free British woman has any cause to be ashamed. "Behind this pleasant ending," says "A Wayfarer" in the *Nation*—

> lie more than two generations of toil, battle, defeat, disillusion, and, at the last turning but one, despair. Suffragettism is well forgotten now; but there is no wisdom at all in forgetting that hundreds of women laid their loves and their lives on the altar of women's rights long before its gift was visible to them.

There is truly no wisdom in forgetting one jot or tittle of the sacrifice that has gone to produce the present situation, whether it was made by the gallant women who faced the loathsome and vulgar opposition of the early days of the movement, or by the gallant women who, putting a new spirit into the cause, went to prison in hundreds sooner than submit to subjection. The *Manchester Guardian* (June 21) recognises the value of the militant contribution to the women's movement, when it says—

> They had to show that not only reason but the passion of self-surrender in a just cause was on their side. Some did this wisely and with restraint, others perhaps not wisely nor too well. What the women did achieve, however, was to make men understand that they were in earnest. . . . The irritation is forgotten, the sense of women's real and impassioned resolve to have freedom remains.

However calm to-day's victory may appear in comparison with the passionate struggle of yesterday, it is indisputably a victory that we owe to all the women "who laid their loves and their lives on the altar of women's rights," whatever form their offering may have taken.

There are, of course, other reasons for a quiet acceptance to-day of what would have been the subject of great public rejoicings, six years ago. The cloud of a world-wide war hangs over us all, deadening the emotions and mortgaging our power of rejoicing in anything—even in what is a real victory for freedom. But that is not all. As has been said often before in these columns, it is possible to be glad over the enfranchisement of 6,000,000 duly qualified and standardised women; but it is not possible for a democrat to be wildly enthusiastic over it. Imagination is not easily fired by a vision of the sword of freedom being placed in the mature hand of a Local Government woman elector aged 30 or upwards. Fortunately, she is not nearly so prosaic as she sounds; and, unlike Dr. Johnson's camel, it is easier to define her than to know her when you see her. But the thought of her, as such, is not inspiring; and when the younger generation comes knocking at the door it is surely prudence gone mad to keep half of it knocking until it is 30—and likely to be very disturbing to those who are on the right side of the door.

But when all is said and done, it is "a famous victory" that we are on the point of winning; and if it is regarded with more thankfulness by those women among us whose age will not disqualify us for enfranchisement than by those younger spirits who are burning to break down with one blow, like Russian rebels, all the many barriers that are set up against freedom, it is not because we shall have votes under this Bill and they will not, but because we have worked and endured and made sacrifices for so many more years than they have. This measure of enfranchisement spells victory to the older women only because it is an instalment of a future victory, the complete enfranchisement of all women. It does not blind any woman to its absurd limitations, nor to her wide obligations in regard to that future.

The Future that is before us

For it is only the future that matters to any reformer or any rebel;—and every reformer by the grace of God is at least halfway to being a rebel. Before us, with our six million votes, lie infinite possibilities. Perhaps, for a time, women will still have to band themselves together: first, to secure the enfranchisement of all women, and, secondly, to secure those preliminary reforms that will place women on an absolute equality—political, legal, and economic—with men. To catch up, as it were—to make good the leeway that has been lost all down the centuries through the subjection of women—women voters will probably find it useful at first to remain in special organizations of their own, at all events until their full freedom of opportunity has been won. But the real future of enfranchised womanhood, the real future towards which our eyes have been turned all through the years in which we have toiled and suffered for our cause, is a future in which there will be no woman's movement and no women's rights or wrongs, a future in which men and women, as human beings and colleagues, will use the freedom they have so hardly won to free the peoples of the world. There is only one danger in winning freedom—a danger that is absent from the fight for freedom—and that is the danger lest it bring with it a contentment that would tie our hands for the rest of our days. We have only to look round the world to-day, beginning with our own country, to see how false in the case of enfranchised British women such contentment would be.

Evelyn Sharp.

THE RECORD OF HALF-A-CENTURY

By F. W. Pethick Lawrence

The prospect of the passage in 1917 of a Bill enfranchising women in this country recalls the fact that the parliamentary agitation is just 50 years old. It was in May, 1867, that the first Woman Suffrage petition was presented to Parliament by John Stuart Mill.

The half-century since then divides itself quite naturally into three periods. The first, from 1867 to 1884, was the period of hope, when it seemed likely that Parliament would yield to the growing constitutional demand on the part of women. The second, from 1884 to 1905, was the period of disillusionment, when women learnt that politicians were deaf to the claims of justice and would not hesitate to stoop to any device to keep them from their rights. In the third period, from 1905 to the present day, women by the sheer weight of their own onrush have overborne the factitious opposition of the politician.

Veterans of the Movement

With the exception of the veteran Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy, who organised the petition of 1867, Mrs. Fawcett, whose first public appearance was in 1870, and Mrs. Haslam of Ireland, few are now alive who have been closely identified with the struggle all through; but those who played an active part in the later phases are many. To these the story of the agitation is a living memory in which the principal events are closely woven into the fabric of their own being. But, besides these, there are numbers who for various reasons have not hitherto thrown in their lot with the movement but who now are deeply concerned with it.

For each and all the story of the work of the half-century presents to-day a fascinating study. Opportunely, a new book* has just been published by Miss A. E. Metcalfe, which covers the whole period. It is a plain unvarnished tale, told without heat or exaggeration, which gives all the essential facts, glossing over nothing and explaining nothing away. Miss Metcalfe wisely expresses no moral judgment of her own either for or against militancy as a whole, or for or against any particular phases of it. She leaves that judgment to be formed by posterity, or by the individuals composing it, according to their ignorance or their experience, or perhaps according to their temperament. But though the book is written with the calm dispassionate spirit which befits the historian, the facts themselves belong to that heroic category which stir the blood and fire the imagination of men and women.

Pioneers of a New Idea

We see first the early pioneers struggling with the birth-throes of a new idea. In the midst of ridicule and contumely, in defiance of the universally recognised opinions and of the whole established order, they dare to believe that women, members, as it was supposed, of the subject and inferior sex, actually have rights concurrent with and not subordinate to the rights of men.

Then come the political pioneers, with John Stuart Mill at their head, who communicate the new doctrine to an astonished House of Commons, and the men and women who dare to go up and down the country holding large and increasing meetings, claiming the extension to women of the principle that taxation and representation must go together. We see a larger and larger number of Members of Parliament pledging themselves before election to support Woman Suffrage in the House of Commons.

The Great Betrayal

Then comes the great betrayal in 1884, when 104 Members of Parliament, professing friendship but in reality glad to be relieved of their responsibility, yield to Mr. Gladstone's devices to prevent the passage of Woman Suffrage into law. "The immediate result," says Miss Metcalfe—

> was a severe set-back to the movement, for though the next Parliament contained 314 "known friends" (since which time known friends of the movement have always been in a majority over avowed opponents), and though the workers continued their efforts with marvellous patience and courage, no less than twenty years elapsed before the question again became prominent. During that period, it is true, only two years (1894 and 1898) passed without some effort being made by Parliamentary friends of the movement to secure discussion of the subject, either by means of a Bill or a resolution. Various devices were, however, adopted to postpone discussion. Either the day was taken by the Government, or the measure was "blocked," or it was crowded out, or, as on one occasion, the House rose for the Easter recess the day preceding the date secured.

Meanwhile, outside Parliament, women devoted themselves to various forms of activity. Some joined branches of men's political organisations. Some took up municipal work, securing the right to elect but not to be elected, in 1888. Others turned away from political life altogether and became pioneers in opening up professional and business careers for women. There were also some who continued struggling for the Parliamentary vote, devoting themselves principally to getting petitions presented to Parliament. During the years 1890 to 1905 more than 2,000 such petitions were presented with an aggregate of over 190,000 signatures, while one special petition to Members of Parliament not so presented alone contained no less than a quarter of a million.

The Rise of the Militants

Parliament, however, remained obdurate and even contemptuous and it was not until a new vitality had been put into the movement by an unexpected change of tactics that a different attitude began to be adopted. In 1905 militancy was started. Judged by later standards it was militancy of a very mild order. It meant going to meetings of Cabinet Ministers, putting a question as to what the Government as a Government was prepared to do, and refusing to be put off with an evasive answer. In the following year it also took other shapes. Women met in a "convention," and, marching to the House of Commons, broke the rules of the House by attempting to make speeches in the outer lobby. At by-elections the militants adopted a new political attitude; they passed over the professions and protestations of individual candidates and brought all their force to bear against the Government nominee, on the ground that the Government were really the persons responsible for keeping women unenfranchised and that an attack on their nominees at elections was the only sound form of political warfare.

Passive Resistance and Prison

As time went on militant women held other "conventions," which tried to make their way to the House of Commons and were stopped by the police. The women used no violence except that they struggled against the violence used upon them, and large numbers were arrested. Prison sentences, generally in the second division, followed.

These methods continued for several years unchanged. Meanwhile both the "militant" and "constitutional" sections of the suffrage movement were holding great indoor and outdoor meetings at which immense numbers of people were present. At one meeting organised in Hyde Park by the W.S.P.U. it was estimated by the *Times* newspaper that half-a-million people were present. The large Albert Hall in London was filled to overflowing several times a year, and all the biggest halls in the country were brought into requisition. Parliament did not yield, but an entirely different tone was introduced into the debates, and it was realised that the question was one which ought to be dealt with seriously.

More Violent Militancy

However, as nothing was done, militancy increased in numbers and in intensity. Women felt that they ought not to be treated in prison as criminals but as political offenders, and adopted the Russian method of the hunger strike to enforce attention to their claims. The Government replied by forcible feeding. Again, some women felt that they ought to meet the violence of the police by violence and do damage to property rather than suffer violence to be done to their bodies. Stones were thrown and windows were broken. For a time it looked as if a period of conciliation might end the struggle in a compromise; but when this failed, militancy on a still wider scale recommenced. Then more violent methods were adopted by a section of the militants including incendiarism and other wholesale destruction of property. The Government tried ineffectively more vigorous repressive measures, including the special coercion Act generally known as the Cat and Mouse Act. Miss Metcalfe records faithfully all these events and shows the state of internal confusion at which the country had arrived in 1914.

Then came the war, and with it cessation of domestic strife. At first, the mere idea that a constitutional change could be carried out during the war was treated with ridicule. But some of the suffrage societies continued to peg away, and at last it became evident that when a new Reform Bill came it would have to include women. The later chapters of events are matters of current history, and the last is still to be written. Will it be victory?

---

* "Woman's Effort. A Chronicle of British Woman's Fifty Years' Struggle for Citizenship (1865-1914)." By A. E. Metcalfe, B.Sc., with an introduction by Laurence Housman (Blackwell, Broad Street, Oxford, 3/6 net.).

UNITED SUFFRAGISTS

27, Chancery Lane, London, W.C. 2. Telephone, Holborn 5880

Colours: Purple, White and Orange

THE COMMITTEE

Mrs. Cavendish Bentinck
Miss Brewster (*Hon. Secretary*)
Mr. Albert Dawson
Major H. J. Gillespie, D.S.O. (*Hon. Treasurer*).
Mr. Gerald Gould
Mrs. Ayrton Gould (*Hon. Treasurer pro tem.*)
Mr. Laurence Housman
Mr. George Lansbury
Mr. Henry W. Nevinson
Miss Evelyn Sharp
Mrs. Ben Webster (Miss May Whitty)
Mrs. Elaine Whelen.

OPEN AIR CAMPAIGN

Organiser: Mrs. Gregory, 6, Gibson's Hill, Norwood, S.E. 19.

The meetings during June have been excellent. On June 10 Mrs. Davies spoke to a large audience who were most impressed with her first-hand knowledge of the poor mother and woman industrial worker, which she had gained through her work as a sanitary inspector in South London. She emphasised the need of the vote to improve conditions in the home. Will U.S. members come and bring their friends to these fortnightly meetings in Hyde Park, held in July? (See Campaign List.)

THE CAMPAIGN

Monday, July 2; 7.30 p.m.—Informal Meeting.—Corporation Chambers, Bolton. Members and friends invited.

Tuesday, July 3; 8 p.m.—Open Meeting.—U.S. Women's Club, 92, Borough Road, Southwark. Speaker: Miss Margaret Hodge.

Sunday, July 8; 5 p.m.—Open Air.—Hyde Park. Speakers: Mrs. Gregory, Miss Hodge.

Tuesday, July 10; 8 p.m.—Open Meeting.—U.S. Women's Club. Speaker: Miss Underwood.

Tuesday, July 17; 8 p.m.—Open Meeting.—U.S. Women's Club. Speaker: Miss E. Picton-Tubervill on "Y.W.C A. War Work."

Sunday, July 22; 5 p.m.—Open Air.—Hyde Park. Speakers: Mr. Clifford Rowe, Miss Wertheim.

Tuesday, July 24; 8 p.m.—Open Meeting.—U.S. Women's Club.

Tuesday, July 31; 7.30 p.m.—Members' Meeting.—13, Suffolk Street, Birmingham.

U.S. WOMEN'S CLUB

92, Borough Road, S.E.

Secretary: Miss V. Aitken. Tel.: Hop 4172

The club meetings have been excellently attended this month, in spite of the long, light evenings—which, by extending the children's recreation time, tend to decrease that of their mothers—and the interesting lectures given by Miss Enfield, Miss Harriet Newcomb, Miss Elsie Chick, and Lady Emily Lutyens have been very much appreciated. The concerts, too, on each occasion have obtained a "full house," and thanks are due to Mrs. Whelen, Miss Brown, and Mr. Threadgold for their most successful programmes.

Summer Outing and Holidays

Members are already beginning to look forward to the annual summer outing, planned for Saturday, July 23, and we would warmly thank all those friends who have so kindly and generously contributed to this and the Holiday Fund for sending members away to the seaside—a list of whose names will appear in due course. The fund is still open, and we shall be glad of any further contributions.

A Generous Friend

We must, however, tender special thanks to Mrs. Lawrence Bradbury, who has most generously sent us a cheque for £20, to be spent on the summer outing, the residue to be added to the Holiday Fund.

Wanted!

Will anyone help us at the club on Saturdays, from 6—9? Who will send us gifts of jam, marmalade, bread, butter, sugar, honey, flowers? It is increasingly difficult to supply refreshments at a reasonable price to our members, without gifts from outside.

ASHFORD U.S.

Hon. Sec.: Mr. John Marsh, 45, Royd's Road, Willsborough, Kent. Organizer: Miss Maude White, Magazine House, Winchelsea, Sussex

Successful meetings have been held during June. At the open-air meeting Adult Suffrage was the subject. Mrs. Baker, a prominent member of the Women's Labour League, interested her hearers in a powerful speech. She also spoke at the Wesleyan Church on "Women as Citizens." A new member was made. VOTES FOR WOMEN sold well, and we are greatly indebted to Miss Jellicoe, who has kindly promised to allow members to give her an order for the paper at the Post Office, High Street. Members must give in their names, and she will have the papers sent once a month. We are glad of her help, as so many people have asked us where they can buy a paper locally.

It is with great regret that we have to record the death of Mrs. Marsh, wife of the Ashford U.S. secretary. She was a very keen member, and her loss will be felt.

Another sad thing to record is that during the air raid at Ashford, Miss Sparkes, a member of the Girls' Club, was killed. She went into her garden to look at the aeroplane, and was at once blown to pieces.

Gratefully acknowledged: Half Mrs. Baker's travelling expenses, Mr. H. Lee.

BIRMINGHAM U.S.

Hon. Sec.: Miss Julia Green, 13, Suffolk Street

An enthusiastic meeting was held on June 12. It had been arranged at a previous meeting to visit members who seemed to be losing interest, and the reports of the visitors were received, and affiliation fees to headquarters paid. The next meeting will be on July 31, at 7.30.

BOLTON U.S.

Hon. Sec.: Miss S. W. Holden, 110, Tottington Road, Harwood, Bolton

Our usual meeting was held on the first Monday in June, the principal business being to discuss the agenda of the Joint Conference of Bolton Women's Organisations to be held on the following Saturday. The Conference was most successful, and promises to be the forerunner of an educational campaign on social and industrial problems. Forty organisations took part, and the proceedings were well reported in the local press. Our branch sent four delegates and two stewards.

GLASGOW U.S.

Hon. Sec.: Mr. E. M. Macaulay, 44, Albert Drive, Crosshill, Glasgow

Various members' meetings have been held at our office, 55, Bath Street, during May and June. In May we received an invitation from the Women's Labour League to send two delegates to their Conference, to be held in Glasgow on May 26. Mrs. Chalmers Smith and Mrs. Hay were elected as delegates, and attended the Conference. The following resolution was passed at this Conference: "In view of the very great number of women who will be displaced from their present employment at the end of the war, it is desirable that this Conference consider the advisability of forming a commttee for Scotland on lines similar to that working in England, namely, the "Standing Joint Committee of Industrial Women's Organisations." Later, we were advised that the W.L.L. was taking steps to form such a committee, and we were asked to send two representatives from our Branch. Mrs. Hay and Mrs. Nixon were elected.

HENDON WOMEN'S FRANCHISE SOCIETY

(Affiliated to United Suffragists)

Hon. Sec.: Mrs. McCabe, 49, Bridge Lane, Hendon, N.W.

The annual meeting of the society is to take place in July, the date to be governed by the length of time needed to pass the Bill now before Parliament. We hope the result will be the occasion for great jubilation, and the society will need to consider and discuss its future work.

A copy of the report of the year's work and notice of meeting will be sent to each member in good time, and we hope to have a good attendance.

LIVERPOOL U.S.

Hon. Sec.: Miss Isabel Buxton, 111, Queen's Road, Liverpool

To Mrs. Paul's limitless kindness the only possible thing was added—ideal weather, to make our garden party at Caldy on Saturday, June 16, an absolute success. Our grateful thanks to our hostess, both for the arrangements and her substantial addition to our library; also to Miss Marks for her well chosen impromptu remarks. We have now some twenty-five books in the library, and over £3 with which to buy more. We hope soon to boast all the recognised works on Suffrage and allied causes. Books will be lent at 1d. per week, the money so collected being spent from time to time on additions.

AN ANNUAL REPORT

The Hampstead and Golder's Green Branch of the U.S. is to be congratulated on the admirable record of work done in 1916-17, shown in the annual report just issued by its committee. Although, like all the U.S. Branches, this one was started after war broke out, it has made a really fine effort to keep the Suffrage flag flying in spite of all difficulties. Besides holding a successful public meeting, a members' meeting, and a number of drawing-room meetings, the branch supported all meetings organised by headquarters, and contributed greatly to the success of the mass meeting held in the Kingsway Hall, last February, by the National Council for Adult Suffrage. In addition, the Hampstead and Golder's Green Branch undertook the Provision Stall at the Christmas Sale in aid of the U.S. Women's Club, and contributed £24 10s. to the total sum then raised. Miss Newcomb (chairman), Miss Solomon (hon. secretary), and all their colleagues are to be congratulated on their practical support of the cause throughout this difficult time.

MRS. FAWCETT'S BIRTHDAY

Mrs. Fawcett, LL.D., the President of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, and one of the pioneers of the woman suffrage movement in this country, celebrated her seventieth birthday on June 11. She received a large number of letters and telegrams of congratulation, both from suffrage organizations and individuals, the latter including the Lord Mayor of London, Mr. C. P. Scott, Mr. W. H. Dickinson, M.P., Lady Cowdray, Lady Brassey, the staff and lecturers of Newnham College.

On behalf of the United Suffragists, Miss Brewster (Hon. Secretary) and Mrs. Ayrton Gould (Hon. Treasurer) sent congratulations to Mrs. Fawcett with a bunch of irises tied with ribbons in the purple, white and orange colours of the U.S. The following reply was received from Mrs. Fawcett:—

Dear Mrs. Ayrton Gould and Miss Brewster,—Will you tell the United Suffragists how much I appreciate their good wishes on June 11, and their kindness in sending me such a lovely sheaf of irises in their colours. The irises themselves and the kind thought which sent them have been a great pleasure to me.—Yours very sincerely, M. G. FAWCETT.

◆

IN MEMORY OF EMILY DAVISON

The anniversary of the day on which Emily Davison died, as the result of a protest against the continued disfranchisement of women, was marked in London by a meeting in Hyde Park, at which the following Suffragists, representing various Suffrage Societies, spoke on the cause which had meant so much to her:—Miss Hodge, Mrs. Walker, Miss Mary Richardson, and Mrs. Mary Leigh. An allusion to the day was also made by the Rev. C. Wills in his sermon at the evening service in St. Thomas' Church, Camden Town.

At St. Mark's, Farrow-on-Tyne, a Solemn Requiem Mass was sung at 10.30 a.m. on June 9; and on the following day the grave of Emily Davison was visited at Morpeth, and wreaths were placed upon it by her mother and sister and some of her old comrades in the movement. A Memorial Meeting was also held in the market-place at Morpeth.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S FRANCHISE CLUB
9, GRAFTON STREET, PICCADILLY, W.
Subscription: 1 Guinea per annum, from date of entrance
(Irish, Scottish and Foreign Members, 10s. 6d.)
WEEKLY LECTURES, HOUSE DINNERS.
Valuable Feminist Lending & Reference Library
FREE TO MEMBERS. (Non-Members, 5s. 6d. per annum.)
EXCELLENT CATERING. LUNCHEONS AND DINNERS FROM 1/-
All particulars—Secretary. Tel.: 3932 MAYFAIR.

ELECTORAL REFORM BILL IN COMMITTEE

Woman Suffrage Majorities of Seven to One and Twelve to One in the Commons—All the Franchise Clauses Through the Committee Stage—Anti-Suffragists in the Last Ditch

PROGRESS OF THE BILL

Bill Introduced, May 15, by Mr. Walter Long:—First Reading. Passed without a Division.

Second Reading, May 22 and 23, Moved by Sir George Cave:—Passed by a Majority of 298.

Ayes	329
Noes	40
Majority	289

Committee Stage entered, June 6. Sir George Cave in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1 (Men's Parliamentary Franchises), June 7:—Passed by a Majority of 170. (Ayes, 184; Noes, 14.)

Clause 2 (University Franchise), June 18:—Amended and agreed to without a Division.

Clause 3 (Men's Local Government Franchise), June 18:—Amended and agreed to without a Division.

Clause 4, Sub-Sections 1 and 2 (Women's Parliamentary Franchise), June 19:—Sir Frederick Banbury's Motion to leave out these two Sub-Sections debated all day and thrown out by a Majority of 330.

Ayes	387
Noes	57
Majority	330

Sub-Sections 1 and 2 (resumed), June 20:—Mr. Peto's Amendment to lower age-limit to 21 thrown out by a Majority of 266. (Ayes, 25; Noes, 291.)

Sub-Section 3 (Women's Local Government Franchise), June 20:—Agreed to without a Division.

Clause 4, June 20:—Passed by a Majority of 197.

Ayes	214
Noes	17
Majority	197

THE DEBATE—JUNE 19-20

Passages from some of the Speeches

Sir Frederick Banbury (who moved the Amendment to delete Sub-sections 1 and 2 of Clause 4):—I do not think there can be any doubt that there are a large number of women engaged on war work who do not want the vote, and I would like to ask whether the anti-suffragists are to find, as a penalty for their patriotism, that it is made the very ground on which the revolutionary change which they do not want is to be thrust upon them? . . . The vote, in my humble opinion and in the opinion of a much greater than myself, is not a reward to be given because somebody has done something which is meritorious. It should be given because the people to whom it is given have shown that they are fit and capable to exercise the duty which is thrust upon them. . . .

Women are likely to be affected by gusts and waves of sentiment.

Sir Charles Hobhouse (who seconded):—We are forcing upon them a double obligation of motherhood and an artificial complication of industry and politics. Just consider whether they are physically capable of bearing all these burdens, greater burdens than have been put on the strongest man in the country. . . . You have at the present moment certain statistics which show that both the birth and marriage rate are decreasing. Can you adopt at this time a policy which might mean an immense destruction of the population of the country which it is essential should not only be retained, but increased?

Lord Hugh Cecil (opposing Amendment):—I believe it to be a very serious matter that any important body of opinion should be discontented and dissatisfied, and it always ought to weigh heavily on Parliament in extending the franchise that there is a body of citizens who very much wish to have it, and who wish it so keenly that it produces a disordering and disturbing effect upon them. . . . It is my conviction that the great majority of the male voters who will be enfranchised by this Bill do not care, but there is a section of the women who do vehemently care, and it is extraordinarily unstatesmanlike not to have regard to them. . . .

I do not understand how the right hon. Baronet (Sir C. Hobhouse) faces the fact that women survived getting the municipal vote without damage to their moral character, and when he talks of the sentimentalism which is to be introduced into politics, I do not see that the County Council is particularly sentimental. There is no great wave of sentimentality in municipal politics.

Mr. Burdett-Coutts (supporting Amendment):—As long as war is possible; as long as it may be necessary for the safety and strength and honour of the nation, woman is not and never can be—it is an unalterable law of nature—a complete unit of responsibility in the national life. You cannot separate the life of the nation from the capacity to fight for it when it is attacked by other nations and the obligation to die for it on the field of battle. I submit you have no right to give woman the power of deciding when a complete measure of responsibility for carrying that decision into effect does not, and cannot, by the law of nature, reside in women.

The Attorney-General — Sir Frederick Smith (opposing Amendment):—Many women have incurred risks comparable to the risks which have been incurred by men, and we must not omit to notice that in this War we are not merely using selected gladiators to represent their countries, but that whole peoples are engaged both as aggressors and as the subjects of attack, and that the position of women in this City of ours, where an air raid may take place to-morrow, requires from them the same combatant qualities and constancy and courage as are required from every section of the population. I still am averse to the concession of votes to women, but many of the old arguments no longer seem to me to have the old force. . . .

Whether I continue to oppose it or not, the women may get the vote. I make no secret of that. I may be quite right or quite wrong, but if I am right it affords some practical justification for the course I have adopted. . . . I shall reserve to myself, as I know many hon. friends of mine have done, if the Bill as a whole breaks down the most complete liberty of action, at a later stage on woman suffrage.

Sir John Simon, K.C. (opposing Amendment):—If we are going at the end of the war to have to solve facts, tendencies, and contradictions which are bound to arise in industry, you cannot expect justice to be done to that part of the industrial army which consists of women if you provide every Member of Parliament with an exclusively male electorate. It is asking of human nature something that human nature cannot possibly provide. To my mind these are the two real arguments which even in the midst of this war it is right that we should recognise. There is this great change in public opinion, and we should make due provision in this Bill for the representation of women in the Parliament which will come after us.

Mr. MacCallum Scott (supporting Amendment):—I am an opponent of women's suffrage, but I never have had any objection to women being elected Members of Parliament, provided that they are elected by male electors.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald (opposing Amendment):—What is the use of insulting a woman by asking her to make a political speech on a political platform if you tell her she is not fit to come to political judgments and to take part in political affairs? . . . You cannot use moral influence in a degrading way and still call it moral influence.

Mr. Mackinder (supporting Amendment):—Those of us who have opposed women's suffrage, and who intend to give a vote against it, will not, of course, carry on our opposition after the decision has been taken. If it is carried against us, we have then loyally to try to make the system work. I go further. I think also that we have to take up the attitude that we hope that our own fears are wrong. In the interests of our nation, since this House has made the decision, let us hope in all goodness that the fears which we still feel and which we have the duty of legitimately expressing are wrong.

(*Continued on next page.*)

DETAILS OF THE DIVISION

An analysis of the division in the House of Commons, on the inclusion of Woman Suffrage in the Bill (June 19), gives the following result:

	For.	Agst.
Liberal	184	12
Unionist	141	45
Labour	29	—
Nationalist	33	—
Total	387	57

The minority included three leading Ministers—Sir Edward Carson, Mr. Chamberlain, and Lord Edmund Talbot.

THE MINORITY

The following fifty-seven Members constituted the minority in the same division on June 19:—

Sir F. G. Banbury, Sir R. H. Barran, Colonel Hon. B. Bathurst, Mr. R. Blair, Mr. H. L. C. Brassey, Mr. W. Burdett-Coutts, Sir E. H. Carson, Mr. E. Cecil (Aston Manor), Mr. A. Chamberlain, Sir S. Coats, Sir H. Craik, Sir H. Duncan, Sir B. G. Falle, Mr. P. S. Foster, Colonel G. A. Gibbs, Mr. J. A. Grant, Colonel J. Gretton, Mr. R. S. Gwynne, Mr. A. V. Hambro, Lord C. Hamilton, Major C. G. Hamilton, Mr. L. Hardy, Sir C. S. Henry, Sir H. F. Hibbert, Sir C. E. H. Hobhouse, Mr. J. F. Hope, Major R. Hunt, Sir F. Layland-Barratt, Sir M. Levy, Mr. G. B. Lloyd, Mr. W. J. MacG. MacCaw, Mr. H. Mallaby-Deeley, Mr. J. F. Mason, Colonel E. C. Meysey-Thompson, Mr. J. T. Middlemore, Mr. P. A. Molteno, Mr. H. Morison, Mr. A. H. Paget, Mr. B. E. Peto, Sir W. E. B. Priestley, Sir C. Quilter, Mr. J. F. P. Rawlinson, Sir J. Rutherford, Mr. A. W. Samuels, Lieutenant-Colonel Sir C. Seely, Mr. H. Smith, Lord E. Talbot, Major H. Terrell, Colonel W. H. Walker, Colonel C. E. Warde, Lieutenant-Colonel W. E. G. A. Weigall, Colonel Sir R. Williams, Mr. H. Wilson Fox, Colonel C. E. Yate, Mr. W. Young.

The tellers were Mr. Arnold Ward and Mr. MacCallum Scott.

Sir Joseph Walton (opposing Amendment):—This Bill has my support, even though it does not go as far as I should like, because at any rate it is a great step in the right direction. . . . I believe we are going to see after the war such an economic reconstruction, such an adjustment between Capital and Labour as we have never seen before. I believe that with wisdom we shall have a more prosperous country as a whole, that we shall have a higher standard of living and comfort amongst the great masses of the people, and I believe that will be brought about not by men and women workers fighting each other politically to get certain industrial rights, one class over the heads of the other, but by co-operation between both men and women workers in order that they may have, not superiority over one another but equal rights and equal payment for the same work, which has not been true where we have had sweated industries.

Mr. G. Thorne (opposing Amendment):—What is manifest in this Debate is its apparent dulness. That is its most helpful characteristic for the fight is out of the whole struggle. It is absolutely clear that the fight is won. . . . Instead of forcing public opinion we are following public opinion.

Colonel Sir C. Seely (supporting Amendment):—If the question of who is right and who is wrong cannot be settled, it must be settled by those who are the strongest, and on that principle the majority rule. But if you have a majority of women on the one side and a majority of men on the other, in which way is the physical force? Although I do not say that will happen often, I do say that the fact that that is possible injures finally and fatally the authority of this House.

The Minister of Blockade—Lord Robert Cecil (opposing Amendment):—I am quite aware that it is an extremely attractive view to those who have got the vote that those who have not got it are not fit to exercise it; but I am satisfied that women are not unfit to exercise the vote, and it seems to me that unless I am prepared to advocate a complete revolution in the institutions of our country, I do not see how I can escape, and I never have tried to escape, the conclusion that those women who are in other respects as qualified as men are entitled to exercise the vote also.

Mr. Arnold Ward (supporting Amendment):—I have spoken plainly to the Government to-night, not because I have any right to use this language to a Government, but because I feel I am representing the views of millions of my countrymen and countrywomen, and I am fortified by the knowledge of their sympathy and their support, and because I know that they feel that this is not a constitutional course which the Government and which the House are taking. They feel most strongly that they are not receiving fair treatment. Their very confidence in Parliamentary Government itself is being shaken by being taken unawares at such a time as this. They feel from the bottom of their hearts that this pass into which they are being landed to-night is a disgrace to British statesmanship, and that this transaction, if it is put through in this form, will be branded by English history with indelible disgrace.

Major Sir B. Falle (supporting Amendment):—They (the Trade Unions) promise various things in the way of dilution, but suppose that the women at the end will not give up their places, and have the vote to insist upon keeping them, will not the same weak-kneed, jellyfish backbone which gives them the vote, in the way that the Attorney-General says that it should be given, keep them in their places?

JUNE 20

Major Hunt (opposing addition of Clause 4 to the Bill):—Nor have the soldiers and sailors upon whom our safety and our liberty depend, or the men and women of this country been consulted at all as to whether large numbers of women should be given the vote during the war. Ministers do not appear to care whether they keep their agreements or not. The German Scrap of Paper theory seems to have come across to this side of the Channel.

Colonel Sir R. Williams (opposing Clause 4):—I have tried for some years to study the Divine economy in this matter, and nowhere in that Divine economy do I find a provision that the woman is to be the ruling class over the men. It is male and female, not female and male. I find everywhere that woman is the helpmate of man. . . . The women have wonderful qualities, admirable qualities, helpful qualities, but they are not men's qualities, and never will be, and we have deliberately put the Government of this country into the hands of a sex which has not got that ruling quality, and we are taking away from the men what I believe is the God given quality of being the ruling sex.

Mr. Hemmerde (supporting Clause 4):—I object to the (age) limitation most strongly. I am perfectly prepared, as a practical man, to take what I can get. People seem to assume that those who support women's suffrage have got all we want in this Bill. I want to say perfectly clearly that I support this Clause as, in my opinion, a thoroughly bad clause. I do not think we ought to have two registers at all in this country, and the Bill is based upon an extremely bad principle. I think you should have the same register for municipal purposes as for Parliamentary.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

WOMEN'S FREEDOM LEAGUE. Caxton Hall, Friday, July 6. Mrs. Despard's Birthday Party. 7 p.m., Reception. 8.30, Speeches and presentation of the Birthday Fund. All friends welcomed. Admission 6d.

TO LET.

COUNTRY COTTAGE to Let, Furnished, from early October, in Sussex, close to station and post office. Five rooms and bath-room, modern sanitation, very large garden. Low rental for long period. Box No. 190, VOTES FOR WOMEN, 27, Chancery Lane, W.C. 2.

TO Let, Furnished, Barre-y-ra, Clevedon, Somerset. Beautifully situated on rising ground, within 20 minutes of the sea, 3 sitting and 4 bedrooms; bath; hot and cold water; modern sanitation. Well furnished, with every convenience. Nice garden. Good golf links. Three guineas a week, or terms could be arranged. Apply:—Miss Browne, Hazelwood, Branscombe, Beer, S.O., S. Devon.

TO Let, Two well-furnished Rooms, with attendance; no other lodgers or children.—152, Kensington High Street, W.8.

FOR SALE

FOR SALE, an excellent undeveloped Business in Ladies' Hairdressing and Babies' Hand-made Frocks and Garments. Suit one or two ladies. Hairdressing may be closed, worked separately, or terms include tuition. Connection established. Owner can show good reason for selling. Price, about £250.—Apply, Box 180, VOTES FOR WOMEN, 27, Chancery Lane, W.C.

WANTED

WANTED, a Lady to help in cottage and garden or indoors only. Must be strong and used to country, and thoroughly understand housework. Owner working as "horseman" on farm.—Olive Hockin, Greenham Lower Farm, Newbury.

ELECTROLYSIS, Etc.

ANTISEPTIC ELECTROLYSIS scientifically and effectually performed. It is the only *permanent* cure for Superfluous Hair. Highest medical references. Special terms to those engaged in teaching, clerical work, &c. Consultation free. Miss Marion Lindsay, 12a, London Street, Norfolk Square, W. Telephone: 3307 Paddington.

ELECTROLYSIS, Face Massage and Electrical Hair Treatment. Special terms to trained Nurses. Skilful instruction given and certificates granted. Highly recommended by the Medical Profession. — Address Miss Theakston, 54, Devonshire Street, W.

An Ideal "Warm-Weather" Dish

EXTREMELY palatable and economical are our "Vertex" ready-to-serve dishes—palatable, because they consist of the finest selected meats, specially chosen for their delicious flavour; economical, because they have no bone, and save all the trouble and expense of cooking.

You should try a few of the following. All are packed in hygienic glass dishes under the "Vertex"—Summit of Perfection—Label, ensuring the superfine quality.

"Vertex" Ox Tongues, per glass	3/11	Galantine of Chicken and Ham, per glass	3/-
"Vertex" Calves Tongues, per glass	3/-	Galantine of Turkey and Tongue or Veal and Ham, per glass	3/-
"Vertex" Beef and Tongue (spiced), per glass	2/-		

SELFRIDGE'S

PROVISION SECTIONS

DELIVERY NOTE.—Free delivery to our own and C.P.'s vans. Carriage paid on orders value 10/- and over to nearest railway station in U.K. No goods C.O.D., unless over 5/- in value, and then only by our OWN vans. Please mark envelopes plainly "PROVISIONS." Selfridge & Co., Ltd., Oxford Street, London, W. 1.

EDUCATIONAL

ADA MOORE.—Lessons in Singing, Voice Production, Diction. Visits Brighton, Winchester weekly; West End Studio.—158, Elm Park Mansions, Park Walk, London, S.W.

MODERN SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, Letchworth.—Principal, Miss Cartwright, M.A.; staff includes specialists and University graduates; pupils prepared for professional entrance examinations; bracing moorland air; home comforts.

MRS. MARY LAYTON, F.R.C.O. Voice Culture for Singers and Speakers. Private Lessons in Singing. Singing Classes and Ladies' Choir.—"The Châlet," 2, Fulham Park Road, S.W.

JEWELLERY

WHY KEEP USELESS JEWELLERY? The large London market enables Robinson Brothers, of 5, Hampstead Road, London, W., and 127, Fenchurch Street, E.C., to give the best prices for Gold, Silver, Platinum, Diamonds, Pearls, Emeralds, Silver Plate, Antiques, Old Teeth, &c., in any form, condition, or quantity. Licensed valuers and appraisers. Telephone 2036 Museum. All parcels, offer or cash by return of post.

BUSINESS, Etc.

ARTISTIC OVERALLS, suitable for office, house or garden. Simple slip-on dresses and nursery frocks for children. Patterns and sketches sent on application to—Elizabeth, of The Green Door, Chesham, Bucks.

GENT.'S HANDKERCHIEF bargains. Slightly imperfect hemstitched Irish Linen. Size 18 or 19 inches; bundle of six 3s. 5d; postage 3d. Write for this month's Bargain List free. Hutton's, 167, Larne, Ireland.

TAILOR-MADE COSTUMES.—Latest styles to measure; best workmanship and smart cut guaranteed; from £4 4s.—H. Nelissen, 62, Great Portland-st., W. (late 14, Great Titchfield-st.).

PROFESSIONAL.

"MORE MONEY TO SPEND" (Income Tax Recovery and Adjustment). Send postcard for this booklet to Mrs. Ayres Purdie, Women Taxpayers' Agency, Hampden House, 3, Kingsway. 'Phone, Central 6049.

LAUNDRY.

A MODEL LAUNDRY. — Family work a speciality. Dainty fabrics of every description treated with special care. Flannels and silks washed in distilled water. No chemicals used. Best labour only employed. Prompt collection; prompt deliveries.—Bullens, Cressy House Laundry, Reynolds Road, Acton Green, W.

VOTES FOR WOMEN & A GOOD LAUNDRY
Good Work and Good Wages.
THE BEACONSFIELD LAUNDRY.
19, BEETHOVEN ST., KILBURN
HIGH CLASS WORK ONLY.
SEND a POST CARD for PRICE LIST
Tel: 1832 WILLESDEN.

ISLINGTON DENTAL SURGERY,
69, Upper Street, London, N.
MR. CHODWICK BROWN, Dental Surgeon.
Mr. FREDK. G. BOUCHER, Assist. Dental Surgeon
Established 35 years.

Gas Administered daily, at 11 and 3, by a Qualified Medical Man.
FEE 7s. 6d.

A record of 30,000 successful cases. Nurse in attendance. Mechanical work in all its branches.
The Best Artificial Teeth from 5s.
Send Postcard for Pamphlet.
Telephone: North 3795.
No Show-case at door.

Eat less Bread

Printed by Walbrook & Co., Ltd., 14 and 15, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C., for the Proprietors of VOTES FOR WOMEN, and Published by them at 27, Chancery Lane, W.C.